Previous references.
Ex. F. 12 01

1902-3
(Sep : Revs)

File No. 58-02
Serial Nos. 1—6

Later references.
S.R. 59-10-831-2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—6.

Part B. for February 1909

SUBJECT.

Recognising the Inamdar's right to the excise revenue from toddy of Sarvamangalapuram village in the Nanjanad taluk

---

✓1) From the Excise Commr no. 4583/2819 7/11 1908 submits with his opinion the records of enquiry relating to the claim of the Inamdar to the toddy excise revenue

✓2) To the Excise Commr no. 6338 25/3/09 calls for additional information in the matter

3) From the Excise Commr no. 8838 9/6.4.09 Resubmits the records of enquiry and G. R. S. 58 states that the claim is admissible

4) To the Inam Supdt no. 7655 18/6 6/09 calls for the submission of the Inam Deputy's proceedings of enquiry of the village of Kovadalapuram

5) From the Jaunsar Supdt. No. 1882 28.7.08
submits the copy of the Jaunsar Register of Zamindars

6) To the Executive Commr & Compltr & Supdt of Jaunsar
Settlements. No. 7E 3930-2 & 27.2.09
Recognises the claim

SOH 58-99

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

(REVENUE AND GENERAL DEPARTMENTS).

1. Statement of case in narrative form in regular sequence of subject matter or date.
2. Opinions to be stated only as supported by precedents, or general rules which should always be quoted.
3. Serial numbers in file, &c., to be always stated.
4. Dates of important documents referred should be given.
5. Write on both sides, leaving the same side as margin.

‡ 1. No. and date of latest letter or paper.
2. Catch words to show nature of subject.
3. Subject to be in red and body of note in black ink.

(Full Office Note.)

Subject. Excise Commr's letter no. 4583/251 of 7th Feby 99

Inamdars' claim to the toddy
revenue of the Madapura
Sarvamangala village in
the Nanjangud Taluk, Mysore
Dist

Note.

There is no toddy shop but
there are trees in the village
in question In his petition of
7.3.02 to the Dy Comm. Mysore
Dist. Balaji Rao one of the
Inamdars claims the "revenue
from Shendi" (Abkari &c) and
agrees) But in his statement
before the investigation (Asst Comm
(Mr C.B. Seshagiri Rao) of 20.5.02
it is recorded "I claim the tree
rent only I have been
paid the tree rent by Govt up
to the end of the year 1899-00
except for 3 yrs viz 1893-94, 1894-95
& 1895-96." Mr C. Venkatappa

who has recorded the finding
states that the defendant
says claim is "free grant" only
it will be recognised that
the Settlement on
the other hand recognises
the inamdar's claim to
the Seigniorage from today

The Inamdar does not
seem to have understood
the difference between the
general items of today revenue
& the investigation officer seems
to have taken advantage of
the inamdar's ignorance

But Rule 18 lays down the procedure

the statement taken down by
& the finding recorded by the
investigation officer is not
clear & perfect Inamdar's
enjoyment of the revenue
can only be presumed by
statement of 20/5/02

+ Canarese translation of the
statement of the inamdar ought
to have been placed in the
file ~~under~~ as defined in para 4 of Sec. 201
of the L.R. Code. ~~[illegible]~~

Sch 58 of 07 (3)
under which Sec 202
the enquiry is to be conducted
(vide ~~for~~ rule 29 of C.C. of 1971(8/01)

The Excise Comm has recognised
the claim to the Excise revenue
from toddy under which rules
2, 5 & 13 of the C.C. of 2/8/01.

This is one of the several
claims arising out of the
one & the same Sanad alienating
Kudlapura & certain other
villages — The Case relating
to Kudlapura is before the
2nd Comiller — ~~is order is~~
~~of the order passed by the~~
~~Collector~~.
A draft is however ruled in
accordance with the views
of the Excise Comm

Note 16/5/03 As in this case the Excise Com's opinion differs from that of the Asst Com & as proof of long enjoyment is not clear, put up draft ~~enjoyment~~ enjoining what proof there of enjoyment of

the revenue [illegible] the Standard
for 12 years prior to 1892-93
and requesting the Secretary
to specify the amounts due
to the Standard for past years under the different systems
of levying additional
if he is held entitled to the
excise revenue.

21/5/03

Copy filed to Secy

Tom
22/5/03

22/5/03 Issue
Hy

27. To the Excise Comm.
No 633. 25/5/03
As the Opinion of the Secretary for
India differs from his own and as
period of long enjoyment is at stake
requests him to furnish early information
in the matter.

29 From the Excise Comm
No 8838. 29/5/03
Submits the record & states that he
differs from the Opinion of the Secretary
& hopes that the Secretary is entitled
to the forty rupees for each one
stated -

3967

(5

G.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S/R File No. 58 of 1902

Serial No.

In the letter under disposal the Chief Comr has pointed out how the Dy Comr's decision is considered is erroneous. The Namsellement has conceded the land revenue as is evident from the title deed filed in the record and this has to be accepted under rule 18 (3) of the rules of 2nd Amendment of. In the statement of Namsellang compiled in the late Chief Comr's office a revenue of Rs 311-2-7 is shown from Punchalak on account of this & 13 other villages all alienated by a single Sanad - copy of which is in the file. The said statement has been worked with Gedam Kalli Cheem. S/R 59-02.

The only objection is that the case has not passed thro. the hands of the Dep. Comr as in the case of Gedam Kalli Cheem cited

Above is pending in S/R 17-08. (Annual statement of 13 Khamti villages may please be called today.
Reg
18/8/08

Separate file called today
S/R 59-02

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50 000—17-3.07

3967 (6

G.S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

8M File No. 58 of 1902

Serial No.

D nos 4043 & 4170
8M 178-07

The Exec Comte has perused some correspondence in the claims pertaining thereto. the hands of the Rev. Comte. This file was included in the 8th Conveyance on 12/5/08

It is not clear how the Exec Comte states that rule 3 applies to the case where there is no shop in the village - ordered for orders

Time 18/5/08 {1915 104

mr Secy)

Rule 3 cannot apply to the case as there is no toddy shop in the village I seems to have been inserted by a mistake The Rev Comm has clearly proved that the Inamdar has a right to receive revenue from toddy, which has also been recognized in the case of other villages owned by the same family. A dispute may be put up requiring the claim. There does not seem to be any necessity to call for the opinion of the Rev Comm

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50 000—17-3-07

3967

G.R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S.R. File No. 58 of 1902-03

Serial No.

of the case is sufficiently clear so that his opinion is not necessary on any point

9/5/08

Submitted with a draft accordingly.

K.S. 19/5
22/5/08 23/5/08

28/5-5(4)

Please let me see the Kudlapura file

Sealed
Ee.7.12.07 ending with
G.O. No 662-3 - Ee 7.12.07 dy 1/6/03. Sealed

28/5
29/5

5/6/08 The Inam settlement register of Kudlapura is not in the file. Kindly obtain it & put it up for reference

C.B.B. 5/6

Draft requesting the Karnool DC to furnish a copy sealed.

8/6/08

What has become of the copy that seemed to have been sent. When that case was dealt with.

C.B.B. 9/6

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB-50,00017—3-07

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 58 of 1902

Serial No.	
	Called. alongwith other records Returned to the Record Keeper Government have no interest Send to the Bombay. The records may be in the Police or the Bombay. There are other papers to accompany the copy may submit a list of correspondence. These papers to the Inam Supdt. Issue 11/6/02 mr To Issue 11/6
4	The Superintendent of Inam Settlements No. H. 6551 of 16.6.02. Requests submission of Inam Register Inquiry of Kirdulapoor village in the Ranjangaon Taluka
5.	From the Inam Supdt No 1807 28/6/02 submits the copy of the Inam register of Kirdulapoor called for orders. The Seen (Mr C. B. Mayer) seems to have called for the register in

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50,000—17-3-07

G.R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 58 of 1902

Serial No.

order to verify the statement in para 2 of the draft order, that the Loda Kesa Jeeeeee has been officially conceded to the Inamdar.

The Inam Settlement and the Title-Deed are clear and have conceded "Shendi". A case recognising the right is put up. Rule 9 requires proof of enjoyment of Kheda revenue within the twelve years preceding the year 1892-3 & the Inamdar has produced evidence of enjoyment up to 1884 + has explained his inability to prove enjoyment during the subsequent years.

There being no Shop in the Village, the Case falls under rule 13. Some general Consideration regarding the principle of the rule have been noted in the limited file.

22/8/18

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, dated 7th February 1903.

No. 4583/257 Encl 1 file

From

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharajah of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

Sir,

In submitting herewith the records of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Madapura Inam village in the Nanjangud Taluk, I have the honor to state that at the Inam settlement Toddy revenue has been conceded to the Inamdar. There is no Toddy Shop, but there are only date trees in the village. According Excise Revenue is payable to him, subject to Rules 2, 5 and 13 in Government Proceedings No. 2074-83, R.F. 166-92, dated 2nd August 1901.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

For Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Ec 258

8871

1903

FROM The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

SR 58-02-1.

To The Secretary to the Govt of
H. H. the Maharajah of Mysore
General and Revenue Dept.

Dated 7th February 1903.

Despatched 11 —do

Received

General No. 4583

No. 257

Enclosure No. 1 file

Subject

Submits, with his opinion, the record of enquiry relating to the Doddy revenue of Madapura Inam village in the Ramanagud Taluk.

Ecm
11.2.03

Noted & Ord[er] [illegible]

Secy
6/5/03

No 633
Ex 7-12-01
dy 25/5/03.

To the Revenue Commr
in Mysore

S. R. 58-02-2.

His letter no 4583/251
dy 7.6.2 relating to
the record of enquiry
relative to the
Inam and claim to
the toddy revenue
of the Madapura
Sawamangam village
in the Nanjangud
Taluk, Mysore District

As in this case
the Revenue Commr's
opinion differs from
that of the investi-
gating officer and
as proof of long
enjoyment is not
clear, has the
honor to enquire

calculation of the amount of enjoyment of this revenue by the Maharaja for 12 years prior to 1892-93.

2. The Excise Commr. is also requested also to specify the amount due to the Maharaja for each year under the different systems of Excise administration if they are held entitled to the Excise revenue from Excise.

3. The record proceedings with the letter under ref. is herewith returned.

BG.

25/5/03

25/5/03

24/5/03

D. 3967

Office of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,

No. 8838

Dated Bangalore, 16th April 1908.

S.R. 58-02-3.

From

H. H. Sparkes Esquire .,
Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer Esquire B. A.,
Offg Secretary to the Government of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue Departments

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith the records of enquiry relating to the Inamdar's claim to the Excise revenue from toddy of Sarvamanya Madapura village in the Nanjangud Taluk together with a copy of a docket No. 95 dated 9th October 1907 received from the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District.

2. This village with thirteen other villages was granted on Sarvamanya tenure by His Highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur under a sannad dated 1st. August 1819 which conceded "Eachalpairu" to the Inamdars. The term "Eachalpairu" in this case can only be construed as the Excise Revenue from toddy for the --- reason that it is mentioned in the sannad along with other taxes, as decided by Government in the parallel cases relating to the similar claims of the marginally noted villages based on tha same sannad. At the Inam settlement conducted in the year 1880, the Assistant Mr. B. Rajagopaliah has recorded in column 19 of the Inam register of enquiry that the items of sendi, sayer and forests are enjoyed by the vrittidars. In column 15 under items enjoyed "shendi" is mentioned. It will also be observed that in the Huzur Sarvamanya Kyphiat patti of 1838 mentioned in column 14 an amount of 13-2-0 is put down as the income from Sayer and Ranchabab. A fortiori, the Excise revenue from toddy should have been included in the total assets of the --

1. Kundlapura
2. Taradata
3. Bugur
4. Hoopura
5. Hunasanalu
6. Hunagur
7. Kattebipura
8. Volgere
9. Harabale
10. Kanipura
11. Kanya
12. Siranalli
13. Balata
14. Madapura.

1. Kundlapura
2. Hunasanalu
3. Hunagur
4. Volgere
5. Nonabale
6. Kanipura
7. Siranalle
8. Balabe

the village. The Inam Superintendent has referred to the Asli case of Kudlapura as regards the confirmation to be made by him. In that case the toddy revenue was conceded to the Inamdar.

2. Out of the 14 villages granted by the sannad above referred to the claims of 8 villages to the toddy Excise have been settled and ---- allowed by Government. Every one of these has been regarded at the Inam settlement as a Dhakli to the Asli village of Kudlapura and the confir -mation order recorded by the Inam Superintendent in column 20 of the Inam register of Enquiry of these villages is similar to what is record -ed in the case of Madapura village. In these circumstances I do not -- see how the Deputy Commissioner's opinion that the Inamdar has not esta blished his claim by the terms of the Inam Settlement, can be accepted.

3. Now coming to the question of enjoyment the Inamdar has produce a Mutchalika dated 1st. February 1881 executed by Messrs. Smith and Co. by which they agreed to pay to the Inamdar Rs. 4-3-3 for a period of 2 years from 1879 to 1881 on account of the lease of the toddy excise of the village. Subsequent to Messrs Smith and Co., Messrs Davy Muddappa and Co., were the contractors and the correspondence between the firm and the Inamdar clearly shows that the excise right of the Inamdar was admitted by the contractors. The statement made by the Inamdar in his petition dated 10th. July 1903 that he wanted to institute a suit again the contractors for the Abkari revenue due to him after the settlement of a suit before the Deputy Commissioner between the contractors and th Inamdar of Volgere which is one of the villages granted by the same --- sannad, that in the meanwhile the contractors term of lease expired and that therefore he could not get the necessary mutchalikas executed, is acceptable, and I am of opinion that but for this reason the Inamdar -- should have been in possession of agreements relating to the period sub -sequent to 1881. I may also mention for the information of Government that in the case of the marginally noted kindred villages whose claims have been allowed the question of enjoyment does not appear to have materially influenced the decision.

1. Kudlapura
2. Hirisavale
3. Sirsavalle
4. Balaki

4. As the sannad and the Inam settlement have conceded the toddy - revenue and as the Inamdar has produced fair proof of his enjoyment of

of the same, I differ from the opinion of the Deputy Commissioner and hold that the Inamdar is entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy of the village, especially as the Government have allowed the claim in the case of all the 8 villages which were covered by the same sannad.

5. There is no toddy shop in the village but there is a date grove and the case, therefore, falls under rules 2, 3, 5 and 13 of the rules of the 2nd August 1901. The amount payable to the Inamdar will be verified and checked and a refund bill submitted for the sanction of Government on receipt of orders on the claim in question.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

for Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

7

193

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

To

The Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

Dated 2nd October 1907

Despatched 9th d

Received

General No. 95.
No.

Enclosure No. 1 File with Paris

His memo No. 7286/22

dated 27/29th May 1903 forwarding for additional information the records of Enquiry into the claims of the Inamda of Madapur village in the Nanjangud Taluk to the Toddy Revenue of his Villag

In reply to the above has the honor to state that Mr. Bala Rao, Inamdar of the said village stated before the Special Sub Divisional Officer, Chamarajnaga on 18.7.1903 that he claimed Tree Rent only presuming that the word "Tree Rent" included both tree rent and tree tax and as he came to understand that tree

Rent

Rent did not include tree tax, he claimed before the said Officer both tree rent and tree tax.

2. As regards the proof of enjoyment of the Excise Revenue by the Inamdar for 12 years prior to 1892-93 as called for in the Secretary's letter No. 633- Ex. F. 12-01 dated 25th May 1903, the Inamdar has produced a muchalika executed by Messrs. W. Smith & Co. Papanni & Co on the 18th February 1881, binding themselves to pay the Inamdar Rs 4-3-3 the annual toddy amount from 16th May 1879 to March 1881.

3. The Inamdar has also produced the correspondence from 25-7-83 to 6-1-86 (Serial Nos. 13 to 20 both inclusive). that passed between him and the Contractors Messrs Davy, Muddappa and Co., for the enhancement of the annual amount due to the Inamdar.

4. The Inamdar states in his petition dated 10-7-03 to the special Sub-Divisional Officer Chamaraj nagar that he wanted to institute a suit against the Contractors for the Abkari Revenue due to him after the settlement of a suit before the Deputy Commissioner between the Contractors and the Inamdar of the Inam village Valagere. Meanwhile the contractor's time of lease expired, he was not able to get the muchalikas executed. Granting that the Inamdar enjoyed the income from toddy during the period of Contract of Messrs Davy Muddappa & Co, he has proved enjoyment for 4 years i.e. upto 1884. His excuse that he did not sue the Firm for

for the amount due for the subsequent years as the petitioner was watching the result of an action taken by a brother Inamdar (Valayeri) against the said Firm is not tenable. Under the above circumstances the undersigned thinks that the Inamdar has not established his claim either by the terms of the Inam Register or by long enjoyment. He has not even proved that he had the uninterrupted enjoyment of the Excise Revenue at least for a period of 12 years prior to the year 1891. Hence it is inferred that the decision of the investigating officer is not erroneous.

(Signed) M. Kanta Raja Urs.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

"Copy"

for Excise Commissioner
in Mysore.

G.R.S. 26]

10
581
File No. 02
Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to 3967

No. H6557
& 16-6-08

General and Revenue Secretariat
(S/H)
, *the* 190 .

To The Collector of Ramnad

Sir,

Date of issue 16 June/08

Signed by W Bristow Asst Secy

I am directed to request the favour of being furnished with a copy of the Ramnad petition of enquiry of Koodalpoora valley to Vaigai and Ramnad Tank

I am Sir
Your obedient servant
for Secy

16/6

Asst Secy 16/6/08

over.

SUBJECT.

Asst
13/6

D. 453

No 18
Cir. 1

Inam Superintendent's Office
Dated, Bangalore 28th to 30th July 1908

From

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General and
Revenue Departments

Sir,

As requested in your letter No. Fl 6551 / S.R 58-02 dated 16th June 1908, I have the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register of Koodlapura Village in the Nanjangud Taluk.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

D Ramachandra

Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

11674 3

12

G.R.S. 28]

File No. 58-02

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 453

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

, *the* 190

Date of issue 27-2-09

Signed by

READ— Correspondence
ending with the Collr
Comrs letter no 8838 dt the
16th April 1908 submitting
the records & enquiry
relating to the claim
of the Inamdars of Sama.
Mangere Medapura
villages in the Nanjangud
Taluk to the Collr
of their revenue & the rules
& Letter no 8378/7/08
from the Secy to Govt
Settlements submitting

ORDER THEREON.—No.

over

SUBJECT

24/2

GPB—10,000—10-4-06

Copy of the Record proceedings
of enquiry relating
to the debt case of Koodlapuram
in the Salem Taluk

Order Memo No H3934-2 & 27-2-09
S.8258-02

The village of Madapuram
referred to was with 3
other villages, granted
on Sarvamanyam tenure
to the brittidars of his
Highness the late Maharaja
Krishnaraj Wodeyar —
Bahadur under a
Sanad of the 18th August-1819
which conceded "Gachelpaim"
to the Inamdars along
with certain other items of revenue -

2) It is seen from the
Proceedings of enquiry conducted
at the Inam Settlement
of 1860 that "Sheudi" was
one of the items of revenue
enjoyed by the Inamdars

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

As per cords the
Confirmation to the
made by him, the
Sub'ol of Inam Sette-
ments referred to the
Abli Cases of Kedlapura
the 4 ese revenue from
tody Sholies has been
Conceded to the Inamdar
in the Title deed issued
by the Sub'ol of Inam
Settlements the claim
of "Shendi" has been
allowed to the Inamdar

3. As per cords enjoyment
of the revenue prior to
1892-93. the Inamdar has
proved it upto 1884-85
Satisfactorily
& allowed the circumstances

MGCPB—30,000—5-4-05.

under which he is unable to produce evidence of any of the allegations against the petitioners.

4. In the above circumstances the Govt. of Goa will the case Comes & prays that the Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue writ of Mandamus or any other writ or order in the nature thereof directing the respondents to release the petitioners forthwith.

5. The petitioners have no other alternative remedy except to approach this Hon'ble Court by way of this petition.

6. The petitioners have not filed any other petition in this Hon'ble Court or any other Court regarding the subject matter of this petition.

7. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

8. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

9. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

10. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

11. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

12. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

13. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

14. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

15. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

16. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

17. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

18. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

19. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

20. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

21. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

22. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

23. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

24. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

25. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

26. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

27. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

28. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

29. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

30. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

31. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

32. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

33. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

34. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

35. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

36. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

37. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

38. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

39. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

40. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

41. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

42. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

43. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

44. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

45. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

46. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

47. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

48. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

49. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

50. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

51. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

52. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

53. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

54. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

55. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

56. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

57. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

58. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

59. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

60. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

61. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

62. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

63. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

64. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

65. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

66. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

67. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

68. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

69. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

70. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

71. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

72. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

73. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

74. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

75. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

76. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

77. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

78. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

79. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

80. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

81. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

82. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

83. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

84. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

85. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

86. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

87. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

88. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

89. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

90. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

91. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

92. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

93. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

94. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

95. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

96. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

97. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

98. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

99. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

100. The petitioners submit that the detention of the petitioners is illegal, unjust and improper and hence liable to be quashed and set aside.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Financial (Separate Revenue), dated 27th February 1909.

READ—

Correspondence ending with the Excise Commissioner's letter No. 8838, dated the 16th April 1908, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the claim of the Inamdar of Sarvamanya Madapura village in the Nanjangud Taluk to the toddy excise revenue of the village.

2. Letter No. 18, dated the 28th July 1908, from the Superintendent of Inam Settlements, submitting copy of the Inam register of enquiry relating to the Asli case of Koodlapura in the same taluk.

No. FL. 3931-2—S. R. 58-02, DATED 27TH FEBRUARY 1909.

ORDER THEREON.—The village of Madapura referred to was, with 13 other villages, granted on Sarvamanyam tenure to 74 vrittidars by His Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraj Wodayar Bahadur under a sannad, dated the 1st August 1819, which conceded "echalpairu" to the Inamdars along with certain other items of revenue.

2. It is seen from the register of enquiry conducted at the Inam Settlement of 1880 that "Shendi" was one of the items of revenue enjoyed by the Inamdars. As regards the confirmation to be made by him, the Superintendent of Inam Settlements referred to the Asli case of Koodlapura, the excise revenue of which from toddy has been conceded to the Inamdars. In the Title-deed issued by the Superintendent of Inam Settlements, the item of Shendi has been allowed to the Inamdars.

3. As regards enjoyment of the revenue prior to 1892-93, the Inamdar has proved it up to 1884 and has satisfactorily explained the circumstances under which he is unable to produce evidence of enjoyment during the subsequent years.

4. In the above circumstances Government agree with the Excise Commissioner and recognize the Inamdar's right to excise revenue from toddy of the village.

5. The village has no shop but has only a date grove. The case therefore falls under Rules 2, 5 and 13 of the rules contained in Government Order No. 2074-83—R. F. 166-02, dated the 2nd August 1901.

6. The submission of the bill for the amount payable to the Inamdars under this order should be expedited. In this bill it should be distinctly stated for what year or years Rule 13 is applied, and from what year separate accounts have been kept of the realizations from trees tapped within Inam village limits and what the number of trees so tapped and the realizations therefrom have been.

C. S. BALASUNDARAM IYER,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore returning the records.
The Comptroller, Mysore Government.
The Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

10
10
27

Exd—C. R.

1908-09

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL
(SEPARATE REVENUE)

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 27th February 1909

No. Fl. 3931-2 / S. R. 58-02-6

Recognising the Inamdar's right to excise revenue from toddy of Sarvamanya Madapura village in the Nanjangud Taluk.

GPB—16-3-09—200